

From: Ian Gledhill [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 April 2017 11:15
To: Fiona Bennett
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Pagham South P/140/16/OUT

Fiona, in answer to the four points,

- i. Noted
- ii. The drawing quite clearly shows that a bus would be contained entirely within lay-by. This addresses the safety audit problem.
- iii. I can understand the reasoning why this was left as an island rather than made up to a refuge. However there is the potential for crossing demands in the vicinity of the northern vehicle access; I'd suggested that it would be better to try to accommodate these demands that will occur rather than leaving pedestrians to crossing without any provision. This may also be something worth clarifying with the Safety Auditor as their recommendation is to provide a crossing, and it's unclear if they've accounted for the presence of the bus stop when making their comment.

There would also be the ability as part of the Stage 3 RSA to review the situation. If there is a problem, it may then be necessary to relocate the bus stop.

I'd suggest that a crossing point would be needed further north (as per point i) as there is no continuous footway on the western side of the carriageway.

- iv. Noted, this is fine.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

Ian Gledhill BSc MIHE MCIHT | Principal Planner - County Highways, West Sussex County Council | Location: Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH
[REDACTED]

From: Fiona Bennett [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 March 2017 11:31
To: Ian Gledhill
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Pagham South P/140/16/OUT

Good morning Ian,

Many thanks for your email and comments.

In terms of the outstanding points raised, my responses are as follows:

- i. We are happy to provide you with an updated plan today relocating the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point proposed to the immediate south of the Village Hall access, to the other side of the Village Hall access as you set out below.
- ii. RSA1 – point 2.1.1
A swept path analysis indicating a bus pulling into, stationary within, and pulling out of the proposed relocated bus stop was contained in Appendix 17, and is attached to this email as a standalone plan for ease of reference. Please can you confirm that it is acceptable? Many thanks.
- iii. RSA1 – point 2.2.1
A pedestrian refuge island was not placed in this location as it conflicts with the existing bus stop on the south eastern side of Pagham Road. If a bus was stationary at the bus stop it would result in pedestrians crossing from the north western side of Pagham Road to be stranded on the refuge island until the bus had passed. We considered that this presented a safety issue. However, if you consider it beneficial to have a pedestrian island in this location than we will provide an updated drawing later today, instead of the drawing promised in point (i) above, as this revised pedestrian refuge island drawing would negate the need for an uncontrolled crossing to the north near the Village Hall access. Please can you confirm your preference by reply email? Many thanks.
- iv. In terms of the LINSIG model, I can confirm that signal timings were provided by WSCC. It was apparent that with the pedestrian phase called every cycle this was unrealistic and presented longer queues than demonstrated on the 2016 survey data. Therefore the model includes an all-red pedestrian phase, called every other cycle of the lights, as can be seen in the phase diagrams, stage sequence diagrams and signal timings diagrams included in the LINSIG report (attached for ease of reference – see pages 11&12, 16, 20 and 24).

I trust that the above is helpful. Happy to discuss.

Kind regards,
Fiona

Fiona Bennett

HighgateTransportation



www.highgatetransportation.co.uk

Highgate Transportation Ltd
First Floor, 43-45 Park Street
BRISTOL BS1 5NL
Company Registration Number: 07500534

**We have recently moved – please note our new address*

From: Ian Gledhill
Sent: 21 March 2017 10:17

Subject: RE: Pagham South P/140/16/OUT

Hello Fiona, thanks for the additional information. I'd ask that this is forwarded to the Local Planning Authority so this can be placed on the public planning file. For ease of reference for my response here, I've stuck to those outstanding points from my formal consultation response.

Access

Various matters were raised relating to the principle of the access arrangements as well as the detailed design. The Local Highway Authority still consider that the provision of right turning lanes conflict with the design principles within Manual for Streets 2. However, the LHA also recognise that local carriageway widening is necessary in order to accommodate pedestrian refuges. The right turning lanes are not provided for capacity or safety reasons. The LHA have therefore viewed the access designs on the basis of providing carriageway widening for the pedestrian refuges rather than for the specific purpose of accommodating formal Design Manual for Roads and Bridges compliant right turning lanes.

In terms of more detailed matters, the pedestrian refuges have been widened to 2 metres. Kerb to kerb carriageway widths alongside these refuges exceed the required WSCC minimum widths of 3.5 metres. Where necessary at the northern access, build outs are included to ensure that pedestrians do not cross between parked cars. A further pedestrian crossing point is provided on the southern side of the access to the Parish Council's car park along with a build out on the opposite side of the carriageway. The build out lies immediately adjacent to a residential access. Although the tracking drawings (which is based on OS data rather than a topographical survey) indicates that a standard vehicle could turn into the residential access, in practice given the close vicinity of the build out to the access, it would be more desirable to extend the footway on the northern side of the carriageway and relocate the crossing further north (for example to the immediate east of the Parish Council car park access).

The access arrangements have been the subject of a Stage One Road Safety Audit. The majority of problems have been positively resolved. There are several problems that require further comment.

2.1.1 – The bus stop lay-by is understood to be the same dimensions as that already present. Providing it is demonstrated that a bus can stop entirely within this, the dimensions are accepted.

2.2.1 – Requires the provision of a central island to prevent overtaking within the hatched area at the bus stop. A traffic island has been provided. I have previously advised that the LHA have experienced issues with vehicles overtaking on the wrong side of traffic islands in order to pass a stopped bus. Having looked at this again, it is suggested that the traffic island is upgraded to a pedestrian refuge (this will then fulfil problem 2.3.1), and the matter of the vehicles overtaking buses considered as part of any Stage 3 Safety Audit once the works are in place. If issues do occur, a solution would be to relocate the bus stop rather than remove a crossing off a desire line.

Details for the other problems can be checked through the detailed design.

Highway Capacity

Matters here related more to discounting trip rates for the local centre, convenience store, and schools to ensure a more reflective rate was used. The LHA have previously acknowledged that the trip rate applied within the initially submitted TA is reflective of a worst case. The updated distribution has been discussed and agreed previously.

The only other matter that warrants further comment at this stage is the LinSig model used for the Gossamer Lane/Nyetimber Lane/Grosvenor Gardens junction. This still doesn't appear to include the pedestrian phases that are present on all arms.

The need for highway capacity mitigation to enable all three Pagham developments will be viewed holistically once the cumulative TA is available.

Sustainable Access

I have chased up colleagues in the Rights of Way team regarding the cost of improving the existing PROW between Pagham and Sidlesham. I will chase again.

The additional travel plan measures are noted and accepted. For the other uses on the site, the expectation is that the respective operators will prepare travel plans. The trigger points in the conditions will be reflective of this.

I hope this assists.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

Ian Gledhill BSc MIHE MCIHT | Principal Planner - County Highways, West Sussex County Council | Location: Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH